



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

when they saw their mistake. It is, therefore, necessary to show that Judas was guilty through ignorance, and participated in the sins of the slain. Neither does the sacrifice of *Hezekiah* (2 Chron. xxix. 21, 22, &c.) nor that of *Ezra* (viii. 35) bear any analogy to the sacrifice offered by Judas. In fine, there is not in the whole of the law of Moses any command to offer sacrifices of expiation for Israel on account of the idolatry of individuals. Idolaters were ordered to be stoned (Deut. xvii. 5); no other conditions annexed; no sacrifices prescribed.

I think, from what I have here stated, it is plain, that if Judas offered sacrifice for the living, he did not offer that sacrifice in conformity with any precept or ordinance contained in the law of Moses, and, therefore, the inference aimed at in your "correct translation," and which you made to depend solely on the adventitious support of that law, must, consequently, fail, not having the authority of such law to support it.

I will not now say anything about the right of Judas to offer sacrifice for the dead; but I will say, that the Jewish synagogue, both before and at the time of our Saviour, did practise praying for the dead.

I need not prove it; a clergyman of the Church of England does* it for me—Johnson, "Unbloody Sacrifice," page 292. Speaking of the practice of the primitive church on this point, he says—"They seem to have learned this practice from the synagogue; for it is certain the Jews, in and before our Saviour's time, did use it"—prayers for the dead.

I think it necessary to remark, that it does not appear that Achan was guilty of idolatry. "When I saw," says he, "among the spoils a goodly Babylonish garment, and 200 shekels of silver, and a wedge of gold of fifty shekels weight, then I coveted and took them."—Joshua vii. 21. The sins were alike, you admit; therefore, the others coveted the donaries of the idols, and took them; they did not worship them. The writer does not say they did. And in Deut. vii. 25, 26—"Thou shalt not desire the silver or gold that is on them, &c., lest thou be snared therein, &c.; lest thou be a cursed thing like it." The word *lest* is here worthy of some consideration.

In the foregoing I have been actuated solely by a spirit of candour and impartiality; a question of such grave importance as that of religion should thus only be discussed.

Hoping you will excuse my lengthy epistle,

I remain, sir, yours sincerely,

EDMOND POWER.

In consequence of the difficulty we find in making room for long articles, the length of the preceding letter obliges us to endeavour to be brief in the remarks with which we accompany it. We regret this the less, however, as the subjects of which it treats have been so fully discussed in our pages before.

In a letter from Mr. Aylmer, published in our June number, into which our respected correspondent contrived to introduce a great variety of topics, he asked us how we reconciled with the New Testament our law of divorce, which permitted to marry her that is put away. The point being very irrelevant to the subject we were discussing, we thought it enough at the time to correct his mistake in supposing that there is any such law of divorce. Mr. Power now presses us with the divorces occasionally granted by the legislature, in cases of adultery. And without admitting, as he seems to require, that the connection of the Church of England with the State makes her responsible for every act of parliament to which the Sovereign gives assent, we have no hesitation in conceding that our Church does regard such divorces as valid, and that her ministers do not scruple to remarry parties so divorced. But the prohibition against marrying her that is put away (Mat. v. 32) evidently applies only to one who is put away *contrary* to Christ's command; and our Lord makes the special exception, "saving for the cause of fornication." We believe, indeed, that there are few subjects on which it would be more easy to prove that "the Church of Rome has erred" than in her theory that "marriage is a sacrament," and the deductions which she has drawn thence (in spite of our Lord's words) as to the absolute indissolubleness, in every case, of the marriage bond—a theory the strictness of which has been more than neutralized by her practical facility in the far more objectionable measure of annulling marriages *ab initio*. More important subjects of controversy have hitherto prevented us from devoting an article to this point. We hope, however, to be able to do so at no distant time.

Next in order to matrimony, Mr. Power is so ungallant as to take purgatory. A correspondent of ours had begged to be furnished with any passage in which the Fathers of the first three centuries spoke of purgatory. "W. C. Search" replied by a quotation from the Maccabees; at which we very naturally exclaimed—"What have the Fathers of the first three centuries to do with the Book of the Maccabees?" If Mr. Power wishes to take occasion of this question to discuss the canon of Scripture, we need not be afraid to meet him, only that we think it convenient to keep distinct

separate subjects of discussion. There is no point on which the Council of Trent stands more plainly opposed to facts than in its decision which includes the Apocrypha in its canon. Our Lord and his Apostles used the same Old Testament canon as the other Jews of their time. St. Paul, who counts it one of the greatest privileges of his nation, that to them was committed the oracles of God, never accused them of unfaithfulness in this high trust. And it is demonstrable that the canon of the Jews of that time did not include the Apocrypha. Accordingly, some of the most learned of the Fathers do not include it in their canon. But when we shall have occasion to appeal to their testimony, we do not mean to quote them in the fashion used by our correspondent—"Clement Stromata, Book i., Eusebius Ecc. History," &c., which is much the same as if one was to quote Hume's History of England, without mentioning volume or page—a mode of quotation which ought never to be adopted by any one who is willing that his references should be verified.

As to the remainder of Mr. Power's letter, we shall not continue to discuss further any of the questions which turn on the most correct way of translating different passages of ancient writers. In every dispute there must be a last word; and we are content to invite any readers who are competent to judge, to turn back to our previous articles, to which Mr. Power has referred, and then judge between us. But as to the great questions at issue, something more may be said.

Much of Mr. Power's letter is expended in bringing passages in proof of purgatory, which, in point of fact, only prove that prayers for the dead were commonly practised in early times. We have already exposed this common fallacy (see p. 49). We showed that the primitive prayers for the dead did not proceed on the supposition of there being a purgatory, and that they were offered for the Blessed Virgin and the saints, who no Romanist now would assert were ever in purgatory. We pointed out (p. 59) that many were of opinion that, before the final judgment of the great day is pronounced, it is right to pray that our friends may then obtain mercy, even though we have reason to believe that God has already done what we ask, and that they are already acquitted in his sight; and we added, that prayers for the dead were also offered because the happiness of the faithful departed is believed to admit of increase, as it certainly is incomplete as long as the soul is separate from the body. But Mr. Power himself has incidentally furnished us with the strongest proof that prayers for the dead do not necessarily imply a belief in purgatory. When he was anxious to give proof that the Jews practised prayers for the dead, he offers us, instead of quotations from ancient authors, the assertion of Mr. Johnson, in his "Unbloody Sacrifice." We cannot allow that the mere assertion of a strong advocate of prayers for the dead can be allowed to take the place of proper proofs; but the mere fact that there have been men professing warm attachment to the doctrines of the Church of England, who have advocated and practised prayers for the dead, is sufficient to show that such prayers by no means involve the belief in the doctrine of purgatory.

In our last number we exposed the practice of passing off Church of England divines as supporters of Romish doctrines, by the help of garbled quotations, completely misrepresenting the opinions of the writers appealed to. And we strongly suspect that, had Mr. Power seen with his own eyes the passage in Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice which he cites, he would not have thought it fair, to say nothing about the sentences immediately before it. They run as follow:—

"The ancients did not use these prayers as if they thought of a purgatory: 'tis certain that this last is a modern invention, in comparison with the oblations and prayers offered by the primitive church in behalf of their deceased brethren. They did not allow prayers to be made for such as they thought ill men, either as to principles or practice. They prayed for the Virgin Mary, apostles, patriarchs, and such as they believed to be like them."

The quotation given by Mr. Power, which seems most directly to apply to purgatory, is from Origen. We wonder he did not say from *Saint* Origen. If our readers should ask why the name saint is not commonly given to this excellent man and laborious writer, they will be told that it is because of several heretical notions which are to be found in some of his writings. Some of these relate to this very point, of the state of the soul after death. For Origen had picked up from the Platonists opinions as to the possibility of a purification of souls after death, which led him to conclude that the torments of hell would have a purifying influence on the souls of the wicked, and would, therefore, not be eternal—a notion for which he was justly condemned by the early church. We doubt whether Mr. Power has done the Church of Rome a service by his attempt to trace the doctrine of purgatory to this source.

Lastly, with regard to the passage in Maccabees, we shall not enter further into the question of diversities of translation. Mr. Power seems not to have exactly understood the object of our reference to the case of Achan. Even if the sacrifice of Judas were offered for the dead, we have already showed that prayers for the dead by

no means imply belief in a purgatory. But we said that there is every reason to think that that sacrifice was offered not for the dead, but for the living. The case of Achan proved, that the sin of individuals might bring ruin on the whole people. But the sin of the soldiers of Judas could not be atoned for by the people (as the sin of Achan was) by their putting the idolaters to death (Deut. xvii. 5), since these soldiers were dead already. A devout Jew, then, would find, in his law, no more appropriate guide for his conduct, under the circumstances, than that contained in Leviticus iv., and would naturally offer sacrifice, to avert from the living punishment for the sins for which, he feared, they had involuntarily become responsible. This, at least, is a rational account why Judas should have offered sacrifice for the sake of the living; but we defy any one to produce, in all the law of Moses, the slightest warrant for the offering sacrifice for the benefit of the dead.

In our remarks on Mr. Power's letter, we hope we have endeavoured to aim at the same "spirit of candour and impartiality," by which he has laudably expressed his own desire to be actuated.

ROMAN CATHOLIC CATECHISMS—THE USE OF GRAVEN IMAGES.

STR.—In your last number I pointed out how readily mistakes and inconsistencies arise in the opinions of Roman Catholics, from their neglecting to consult the original documents, which should alone have with them an infallible authority. I would now call your readers' attention to a misunderstanding arising from the same cause, connected, also, with the same subject, that of the second Protestant commandment, and the cause of no little irritation between the members of the two creeds.

This misunderstanding is two-fold—Protestants taking the manuals of instruction in most ordinary use, and sanctioned by ecclesiastics of rank, as representing the doctrine of the Church; and finding the second commandment wholly omitted, or extremely mutilated, somewhat hastily conclude that Roman Catholics reject a verse apparently not very favourable to their doctrine about images. On the other hand, Roman Catholics are indignant at being supposed capable of suppressing an admitted portion of the Decalogue, and offer an explanation of its practical omission as inconsistent with the doctrine enunciated by their own Church, as is the accusation they seek to refute. I think a reference to their acknowledged standards will show that both are alike mistaken. The Roman Catholic Church neither rejects this verse, as Protestants often fancy, nor considers it to have no distinct or additional force, beyond that conveyed in the first commandment, as Roman Catholics suppose, when they account for its frequent omission by saying, that its insertion would be useless and superfluous, and a mere repetition of the First Commandment in different words.

I need hardly say, that this important verse appears in every Roman Catholic edition of the Bible, and cannot, therefore, be supposed to be rejected by them; but it is also expressly declared to be binding on all Christians by the Catechism of the Council of Trent. This is so obvious, on the perusal of its exposition of the Decalogue, that it is not necessary to do more than refer to the passages.* The main point is, therefore, whether it can be omitted on the ground of its conveying no precept, or forbidding no sin, not already enjoined or forbidden in the third verse. I am not discussing at all the view that Protestants, or others exercising their own judgment on the passage, would be likely to arrive at; but I wish to elicit that interpretation which has been made for Roman Catholics, to which they are bound to submit, and in accordance with which they should deal with this fourth verse.

It is to be remembered that the Catechism of Trent, though professing to treat the two verses as forming but the one commandment, yet found it almost inevitable to expound them separately; and after commenting on the first—"Thou shalt not have strange gods before me"—precedes to explain the additional meaning of the second—"Thou shalt not make thee any sculptured image . . . thou shalt not adore them, nor honour them."† Under the latter head it shows that the entire precept points to a "two-fold manner" in which the "majesty of God can be vehemently offended;" the first consists in worshipping images in the grossest form of idolatry, by making them actual divinities—and this may fairly be included in the injunction to have no "strange gods;" but the second is the impious attempt to express in form or colours the image of the true God. This is a command not at all included in the first, nor to be deduced from it by reason—if that were allowed—as a corollary might be from a proposition. I do not say that this is the whole or the true meaning to be gathered from the fourth verse; but it is an interpretation plainly put on it by a binding Roman Catholic authority, and manifestly showing that they held it to contain a prohibition of a sin—important, for by it "the majesty of God" would be "vehemently offended"—and a sin not elsewhere denounced in the Decalogue.

* Our correspondent seems to think an assertion and a proof the same thing.—Ed. C. L.

* Original Edition, Rome, 1567, pages 398, 399, 403 and 415.

† Same, page 403.

‡ Original Italian edition. Rome, 1567.

That such was their mind is clear from the subsequent passages, where they prove, enforce, and limit the exact effect of this "prohibitory part of the precept." No effort of reason, without revelation, could know, with certainty, that it is forbidden to show our honour for the true God by raising statues in his name; to man it would seem but a fitting and just tribute to his sacred majesty. If it was thought necessary that the finger of God should write on the tables of stone the injunction not to take his name in vain—which our ideas of the respect due to his awful attributes might have led us to think superfluous—how shall we venture to omit, as unimportant, the fourth verse, which guards us against a sin into which our reason and nature would rather lead us than serve as any natural protection?

It seems an irresistible conclusion, that the Roman Catholic Church has decided it to be, at least, a distinct and important part of a precept of the Deity, and, though they do not adopt our interpretation, they give it sufficient importance to make its omission, by individual priests and teachers, an unwarrantable breach of their doctrine, as it certainly appears a violation of the frequent injunction applied to these very verses—"Thou shalt not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it."†

As to the fact that this omission is common and usual, it is only necessary to ask for any of the cheap catechisms, in ordinary use among the masses, to be satisfied that the practice of the generality of priests has ventured to differ from the declared theory of their church. I am not aware of any catechism in Italian that gives this fourth verse, for the translation of the Trent Catechism is not in use among the laity. German catechisms, of very large size, omit it also; and in France the commandments are usually taught in couplets, of which the following are the first:—

- "1. Un seul Dieu tu adoreras, et aimeras parfaitement.
2. Dieu envain tu ne jureras, ni autre chose pareillement."

The only Irish one that I have seen with a translation makes the same omission;‡ and there are abundance in the English that follow the example. Is it surprising that Protestants give an unfavourable construction to so general a suppression, and is it not strange that Roman Catholics will not refer to the true standards of their faith, instead of allowing such perversions of their own doctrines?

FONTIUM PETITOR.

IDOLATRY AMONG THE HINDOOS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—The anecdote, told in your paper for November, of the reply of a Tinnevely Hindoo gentleman to a Roman Catholic priest, forcibly reminded me of a question which I often asked myself, many years ago, when I first went to India—viz., "What is idolatry?" that sin so universally denounced in the Bible. This question was suggested by the fact, that while idols were conspicuous in every Hindoo temple, and "under every green tree" by the road side, and while the Bramins themselves were to be seen prostrated before them, they all, when questioned, declared they did not worship idols, but that they bowed down before them as the representatives of the absent deities, to whom, in reality, their homage was addressed.

This reply of the Bramins, connected with the fact that the idolatry of Hindoos is considered in Europe an admitted fact, led me to examine the account given in the 32nd chapter of Exodus, of the first great apostasy of the Jewish nation, when they made the golden calf; and there I was struck with the expression, in verse 5, "to-morrow is a feast to Jehovah." The golden calf was, therefore, no new god, but intended as the representative of the Holy One, who had "brought them out of the land of Egypt;" for, in the 8th verse, this power is attributed to their idol, though, as the people themselves well knew, that idol was not in existence, as an idol, when their deliverance from Egypt took place; they could not, therefore, have imagined that this calf had brought them out of Egypt. The nation were hardly so besotted as to think that; but they held it to be the visible representation of that power which had delivered them from Egyptian bondage.

The belief held by many, that the calf was supposed to be a god distinct from the true, as Baal or Moloch, and that the Israelites, in making it, had determined to change the supreme object of their worship, may have arisen from the expression, in the first verse, "make us gods;" and that in the fourth verse, "these be thy gods;" but the word translated "gods" in both these passages is the same—אלהים—mentioned in the first chapter of the Book of Genesis as the Creator of heaven and earth; and it is with reference to this plural noun that Aaron, in the fourth verse, uses the plural pronoun "these," which would evidently be inapplicable to the single object (the calf) to which he was pointing.

The gross, material worship of a lifeless idol (such as Europeans, who have not lived in an idolatrous country, suppose to exist there) is rarely acknowledged, except

by the poorest and most ignorant classes of the people. The Bramins, to a man, repudiate anything so senseless, and even the lower classes are ashamed often to acknowledge it; while, at the same time, their dread of and reverence for their idols discovers itself on many occasions. Nor need this be a matter of surprise; for acts of power, motion, and knowledge are often attributed to these lifeless blocks, which, if true, would naturally obtain for them the greatest reverence. Thus, on one occasion, in a Bramin's house, in the town of Hoobly, in Western India, an earthen image was produced, very slowly and gradually. First a foot appeared (this was shown to the astonished populace, by the Bramin, as what had occurred during the previous night, while he slept); after a few days, another foot was found beside it; and gradually legs grew on these; and, in the course of months, a perfect image of Vishnu appeared—self-created. Can we wonder if the populace worshipped such an image?

Europeans generally receive these and similar tales with such undisguised derision, that Hindoos seldom venture to tell them the stories which are current among themselves of miraculous cures performed by images, and of the acts of locomotion and supernatural power which are attributed to most of the idols throughout India; but these, remarkable as they are, are fully equalled by the tales generally current of Christian images in Papal Europe. To say nothing of ancient stories, that of the image of the Virgin Mary, at Rimini, in Italy (referred to in a former number of your paper), which moves its eyes (commonly called the winking image), is a matter of the present time. I have heard that this story was strongly reprobated by M. de Sibour, the Archbishop of Paris, as injurious to religion, and calculated to bring it into contempt. Whether the Pope is otherwise minded, or whether he has favoured the world with his infallible opinion, or decided that the miracle was true, perhaps some of your readers may be able to say. In the town of Tournay, in Belgium, there is, in one of the churches, an image of the Blessed Virgin, whose face is quite black. So unusual an appearance excited the curiosity of a gentleman of our party who was looking at the church, and he asked the sextoness the cause. She replied, that on one memorable occasion, when Tournay was besieged, that image of the Virgin had advanced to the ramparts, and, by catching the balls of the besiegers in her apron, had saved the town; but that the powder of the cannon had blackened her face as we saw it. The visit to Tournay which I here narrate occurred many years ago; but I conclude that "the black virgin" is there still. For the story which the sextoness told the priests would not be responsible; but for the state of the image they surely are, as it must have been coloured by their permission: and when images perform such prodigies of valour, who can blame the people for worshipping them?

The charge of idolatry was one brought against the Romish Church, at a very early period, by Mahomed and his followers; and the contempt which they exhibited towards the cross was solely as an object of worship. They believed, too, that the Blessed Virgin was the third person of the Trinity; and though this was evidently an error, even in the corruptest ages of the church, yet it shows Mahomedans considered that she received Divine honours from the Christians with whom they came in contact.

A friend of mine in India had a Mahomedan servant, with whom he used to converse freely on religious matters. This man once classed the prevailing religious systems of India as follows:—"The Hindoos and the Portuguese worship images; the English and the Mahomedans worship God."

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

A RETIRED EAST INDIAN.

Nov. 27, 1852.

FARM OPERATIONS FOR DECEMBER.

(From the Irish Farmer's Gazette.)

Wheat.—We should hope that the greater portion of the seed wheat has been committed to the ground long ere this. Where that has not been the case, no exertion should be spared in doing so without delay; in no case should it be deferred till after Christmas, as after that period it will be getting late to sow any of the winter varieties.

Beans and Peas may still be sown; the best variety of bean to sow now is, the Russian, or the Heligoland, for the feeding of stock; the best for human consumption are, the early Mazagan and long pod.

Peas chiefly used in feeding stock are, the gray maple, Pennsylvanian, and strawberry; for human food, the early Charleston, early Hotspur, double-blossomed May and marrow-fat peas are best.

Storing Roots.—Take every advantage of dry weather, in pulling and storing Swedish and Aberdeen turnips, mangels, parsnips, and carrots, before they encounter severe frosts. Roots, particularly turnips and mangels, intended for late keeping, are much more injured by frosts than most people imagine; for, although no injury is perceptible to the eye, their keeping properties are much injured when exposed to severe frosts. The

site chosen for their storing should be cool and dry, and the best aspect is that facing the north, as, when much exposed to the east or south, early sprouting is the consequence; whereas, if the northern sides of walls, ditches, or plantations are chosen, their sprouting or vegetating is prevented, as long as it is possible, next season. Roots intended for storing till a late period should be taken up very carefully, and the leaves wrenched off by the hand; the crowns will thus remain uninjured, which will be scarcely possible if those employed to trim them are allowed to do so with a sharp-cutting instrument. The tap-roots should not be cut off, neither should the outer bark or skin of the roots be cut or bruised; the roots may be packed on the ground in longitudinal heaps, about six feet wide at the base, and tapering up, about six feet high, to a single root at top. It will be of much service if some branches of brushwood are placed in layers through the roots; they will prevent them slipping and tumbling down, which, without this contrivance, is a fertile source of annoyance. Parsnips and carrots will be much benefited by being packed in pit or river sand. After the roots are packed as above described, they should be well thatched. Roots may also be packed in cool, dry sheds or cellars, and in caves or pits, where the subsoil is dry. Stored as above, any of these roots will keep till an incredibly long period in the spring.

Milk cows should be kept closely in the house, with the exception of about an hour for exercise, during which time their byres should be made clean and comfortable; their food should be generous, for which they will amply pay. Alternate feeds of cooked and raw food are much the best—the cooked in the morning and at night, the raw at mid-day. Cattle thus taken care of are much more profitable than leaving them starving and shivering at the backs of ditches, or poaching the land, in fruitless endeavours to pick up a sufficiency of food, to say nothing of the inhumanity of the system.

Young stock should also be well and carefully housed and fed; they require an abundant supply of nourishing food—as much, or more so, than those full-grown—to be profitable to their owners; it is a ruinous system to keep stock on cold, bleak pastures; and the improving farmer who has once shaken off the sloth and indifference which too often characterize the generality of our brethren, and put his stock on better and more careful keep, finds—in their altered appearance, and the prices obtained at the early summer fairs—so amply remunerated, that he will hardly be tempted to return to old habits.

Pigs.—There is no description of stock to which cleanliness, warmth, and good keep are more essential at this season than fattening pigs, stores, and breeding sows, more particularly as we are under the impression that pigs, for some time at least, will be the best paying stock. Cooked turnips, cabbages, parsnips, carrots, mangels, with a liberal allowance of pea, bean, oatmeal, or barley-meal, will not be lost on the pigs, but pay a liberal per centage.

Digging.—On small farms this is the time to dig all land not under crop; dig deeply and roughly, so as to expose as great a surface as possible to the ameliorating influence of the winter's frosts and thaws. In wet or in drained ground, the land can be dug in ridges, and in dry land it can be dug out without ridges; but in either cases, deeply and roughly, not scratching it in the usual old, slovenly manner. It may remain so until the sowing time, when, if intended for grain, it may be sown and harrowed in without any further preparation. But the mode of digging that we most commend is, to throw up the land as it is dug into high and narrow drills, similar to those made for turnips. This mode can be adopted whether the land is in ridges, or with a plain surface without furrows; the advantages of this method are, that a greater surface is exposed to the frost, snow, and air; it lies so high, that it is quickly dry, and if intended for corn will break down early in the spring in the best possible condition; but if intended for a root crop the advantages are still greater; for if the land is thrown up into drills, 27 or 28 inches asunder, in the spring, there is no more to be done than deposit the manure in the drills as already formed, and split them with the spade, covering the manure from both sides, when the drill is formed again for the reception of the seed, whether parsnips, carrots, mangels, or turnips, &c. Care should be taken in the digging to pick out all scutch-grass and root weeds.

Odts and Ends.—Keep draining, digging, subsoiling, and gathering manure, for without a liberal use of manure the draining, &c., will be of little avail; therefore, gather and manufacture manure by every means in your power; let nothing be lost. Remove all crooked, useless and cumbersome fences, and form new ones; cut down, plash, and lay all overgrown fences. Keep the flail, or thrashing-machine, busy, so as to have fresh and clean straw before the cattle. Scour and clean out all open ditches and ponds. Cut and bruise furze, which is an excellent food for horses or cows, when it can be obtained. Repair and paint implements, where required, and let the well-regulated labour of those dependant on him, and a clean comfortable farm-yard, be the careful farmer's pride and pleasure.

* Dr. Donovan's Translation, page 360. Coyne, Dublin.

Deuter. iv. 2.

† Published by the College of the Sorbonne. Paris, . . .